

execute the budget, Mr. President. That is what the Constitution says.

I have advocated giving the President more authority. In the balanced budget amendment that I helped craft it has been the No. 1 amendment here on the floor of the Senate and in the House for well over 5 years. We have given the President a right to become a full participant in the budget process but he does not have that right now.

Yes, he can veto. But when he vetoes, it is without question his responsibility for the people who are no longer employed by action of that veto.

So we crafted another continuing resolution and he said, "I will veto it. Don't send it down," and it has not gone down.

Last night we passed a balanced budget for 1995.

This President says he will veto it. Mr. President, this is one Senator who is not going to bow to that kind of pressure. I will not vote for a goal or a concept or an ideal. And I encourage all of my colleagues not to vote that way either. We will vote for a balanced budget in 7 years and we will vote for it based on legitimate, legal, responsible figures that tell the truth and show the American public exactly what we are spending and where we are spending it and where the revenue to spend is coming from. That is what this Government and that is what this Congress must do, without question or without doubt.

For, if we do not, the clock continues to tick. A \$5 trillion debt, a \$5.1 trillion, \$5.2 trillion, a \$5.3 trillion, and on and on and on. And the children of tomorrow are going to owe, not \$15,000 or \$16,000 or \$17,000 of their earnings back to Government for the debt we created, it will be \$20,000 or \$25,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000. The American people are smarter than that. How possibly can we continue to do that?

That is why we saw the greatest political realignment ever in the history of our country occur last November, because finally the American people said, "Enough is enough." Mr. President, hear me: I will not bow to the goal or the concept or the idea, because I know what you want. You have already indicated it. You want billions more to spend for programs that are questionable in their nature as to the services they provide.

The American people want a balanced budget. We have now labored nearly 11 months to craft a budget and bring it into that concept and into those parameters. It has not been just the Republicans that have done that; it is Republican and Democrat alike.

So I hope our leadership will not bend. I hope our leadership will listen to their people and listen to the phone calls. Adhere to a balanced budget. Adhere to the tough decisions. Say to this President, if you will not agree with us, then we will continue our work. We will not recess, as I have encouraged our leader not to do, and we will bring down the appropriations bills and we will fund a balanced budget.

I will tell you that is a gun to no one's head. That is simply what the American people want. The hand-wringing is over with. We have spent 30 years playing this game, and I sincerely believe the game is over. It is now time to realize we must do what the American people asked us to do and do so in a responsible fashion.

I yield the remainder of my time.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 5:02 p.m., the Senate recessed until 6:47 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GORTON).

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 18, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2020. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 440) to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the designation of the National Highway System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

At 6:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2606. An act to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as

part of any implementation force, unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by law.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and sent times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2606. An act to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by law; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PRESSLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1396. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the regulation of surface transportation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BUDGET RECONCILIATION CONFERENCE REPORT

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, yesterday, with the Senate's consideration of the Budget Reconciliation bill, the rubber really met the road. This is the real thing.

We have been warning for some time now that this bill would represent the extreme priorities set largely by the majority in the other House. The budget reconciliation bill which the conference set us—conference which effectively excluded Democrats—and which the Senate passed on near party lines, included a very large cut in Medicare. The \$270 billion cut is three times what is necessary to stabilize the trust fund. These plus a cap on direct student loans, reductions in the earned Income tax credit for working Americans, all, in part, are to pay for a large tax break, the benefits of which will go mainly to the wealthiest among us. There are a number of other short-sighted changes in Federal programs including cuts in child nutrition programs.

Mr. President, for the past week we have seen the Speaker of the House and Republican majority irresponsibly shut down large parts of the Government and threaten the credit rating of the United States. This is a long-planned tactic to force the President to accept their extreme budget priorities. Now, those priorities are laid bare in this bill for all to see.

The issue isn't whether one favors a balanced budget. I do. I have voted for one on more than one occasion.

Let us look at balance, as the Republicans have defined it. On the one side,

there are \$247 billion in tax breaks, which mainly benefit the wealthiest of Americans. On the other side, for ordinary, middle-income Americans, there will be increases in Medicare premiums, increases in college loan costs, and for some working Americans with wages under \$30,000 per year, a \$32 billion tax increase. The tax increase on those receiving the earned income tax credit hurts America's most vulnerable workers, including more than 4 million workers who make less than \$10,000. Overall, according to U.S. Treasury data, 12.6 million households would have their earned income tax credit reduced under this legislation. 7.7 million households would see a net increase in taxes.

These priorities are wrong. I have supported a balanced budget. I have supported a budget balanced in 7 years. But, I cannot accept, and I do not believe the President will sign a budget as skewed as the one which is before us today. The issue is not whether to balance the budget or when to balance the budget. The issue is how to balance the budget.

The Republicans have tried to strong arm the President into accepting these priorities. They planned this course months ago. It's bad enough that the majority is willing to shut down functions of the Government which many people rely upon and that they are willing to risk the credit rating of the United States. But, to add insult to injury, we have seen from their own statements that this is a long-planned tactic.

As long ago as April 3, the Washington Times reported that:

House Speaker Newt Gingrich vowed yesterday to create a titanic legislative standoff with President Clinton by adding vetoed bills to must pass legislation increasing the national debt ceiling.

And in May, House Budget Committee Chairman JOHN KASICH said,

We'll probably have a few train wrecks, but that's always helpful in a revolution.

In September, Speaker GINGRICH said,

I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days—not this time.

It is clear again why the majority has been holding the Government hostage. They have a set of budget priorities which do not fare well in the light of day. They are bad for senior citizens, bad for children, bad for working Americans. So, let's get on with it. They can pass it, they have the votes. The President will veto it. And then, we can get on to the real business of resolving our differences. Negotiations need to go forward to reach a bipartisan agreement, so that we can reach a genuine balance budget with a time certain and with the right priorities. This is how our system works. Let us get reasonable people around the table. America is waiting.●

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, late last night the Senate passed unanimously the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1995, including my legislation, the California Cruise Industry Revitalization Act.

At long last, this legislation has left the dock, and once we work out differences with the House on other provisions, we will finally put my State's cruise industry back on track, providing jobs and tourist revenue for California.

I would like to express my appreciation to the bipartisan leadership of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee for their work in moving this important authorization bill for the U.S. Coast Guard to the Senate floor for passage. I particularly wish to thank my Environment and Public Works Committee chairman, Senator CHAFEE, for his diligent effort to fashion a compromise on the difficult issues raised in the House version of this legislation that fall within his committee's jurisdiction.

This Coast Guard bill includes a provision that is critical to a key element of my State's economy, California tourism, particularly our cruise ship industry and the jobs that depend on it.

On the first day of the 104th Congress, I introduced legislation, the California Cruise Industry Revitalization Act, S. 138, to amend the law passed by the 102d Congress which allowed gambling on U.S.-flag cruise ships but that also allowed States to outlaw gambling on ships involved in intrastate cruises. My legislation would lift the ban on gaming on cruise ships traveling between consecutive California ports. The Commerce Committee this summer agreed to include my legislation as section 1106 in the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1995.

Let me explain why this provision is so important to my State.

In 1992, subsequent to the congressional action, the California Legislature dealt the State's tourism industry a severe blow by passing a law prohibiting on-board gambling. However, it failed to distinguish between cruise ships making multiple ports of call in the State while on an interstate voyage, and the so-called cruises to nowhere whose only purpose is shipboard gambling.

Consequently, California's cruise ship industry, which had been growing at an average annual rate of 17 percent since 1989, began to run aground because cruise lines immediately revised their itineraries. The State's share of the global cruise ship business has dropped from 10 percent to 7 percent at the same time growth in the cruise ship business overall has climbed 10 percent a year.

My legislation is essential to restoring California's cruise ship industry which has lost hundreds of jobs and more than \$250 million in tourist revenue since the State law's enactment.

Many California cruise ship companies have bypassed second and third ports of call within California.

The law to prohibit gambling cruises to nowhere has had the effect of discouraging cruise ships from traveling between California ports, even if the voyage is part of an interstate or international journey. In effect, a cruise ship traveling from Los Angeles to San Diego could no longer open its casinos, even in international waters. But if the ship bypassed San Diego and sailed directly to a foreign port, it could open its casinos as soon as it was in international waters.

According to the Port of San Diego, that port alone has lost \$78 million in economic impact, hundreds of jobs and over 300 cruise ship calls. That is more than two-thirds of its cruise ship business.

Los Angeles has lost business as well, with the projected loss of port revenue is \$3 million, with 118 annual vessel calls at risk. Beyond the port, the economic impact to the city amounts to \$14 million in tourism and \$26 million in retail sales. The total impact estimated by the Port of Los Angeles is an estimated \$159 million and 2,400 direct and indirect jobs.

Ports all along the coast from Humboldt Bay to San Diego have suffered economic losses. For a State still recovering from an economic recession, defense downsizing and back-to-back natural disasters, a blow to a major industry in the State—tourism—is unfathomable.

Section 1106 would resolve this problem by allowing a cruise ship with gambling devices to make multiple ports of call in one State and still be considered to be on an interstate or international voyage, if the ship reaches an out-of-State or foreign port within 3 days.

Gambling operations still would be permitted only in international waters. The effect would expand only the non-gambling aspects of cruise ship tourism by permitting more ports of call within the State. California is the only State affected by this bill.

Mr. President, former Congresswoman Lynn Schenk had labored tirelessly to include this legislation in the House Coast Guard bill. Unfortunately, the bill died in the Senate last year when the Coast Guard bill was lumped together with other maritime legislation that stalled.

The future of California's cruise industry rides on this provision. An identical provision is contained in the House version of the Coast Guard authorization bill. I urge my colleagues to swiftly resolve the other issues in conference and send the bill to the President for his signature.●

ANNIVERSARY OF LEBANON'S INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this month we mark the 52d anniversary of the independence of Lebanon. Each